

N00204.AR.002630
NAS PENSACOLA
5090.3a

PARTNERING TEAM MEETING MINUTES BETWEEN 29 JUNE AND 30 JUNE 2010 NAS
PENSACOLA FL
6/29/2010
NAS PENSACOLA

NAS Pensacola Partnering Team Meeting Minutes
June 29 and 30, 2010
Pensacola, Florida

ATTENDEES:

Team Members:

Patty Marajh-Whittemore	NAVFAC
Greg Fraley	USEPA
David Grabka	FDEP
Helen Lockard	Tier II
Sam Naik	CH2M Hill
Greg Campbell	NASP PWD
Gerry Walker	TtNUS
Brian Caldwell	TtNUS

Support Members:

John Schoolfield	NAVFAC (Day 1 a.m.)
Hector Hernandez	CH2M Hill (Day 2 a.m.)
Dawn Marshall	Solutions IES (Day 2 a.m.)
Brian Rebar	Solutions IES (Day 2 a.m.)
Ron Kotun	TtNUS
Pat Owens	(RASO, Day 2 p.m.)
Melissa Brock	TtNUS – Scribe
Stephanie Carroll	The Management Edge - Facilitator

ATTACHMENTS:

- 1- Facilitator Partnering Training Presentation
- 2- Gantt Charts (updated IR and Petroleum Sites)
- 3- Action Item List

MINUTES:

1. **1st Day Check In/Opening Remarks/Resource Sharing/Head Count and Proxies/Guests/Review Ground Rules /Review Consensus Items & Action Items & Parking Lot/Approve Minutes (8:00 - 8:34 a.m.)**

The Partnering Team completed check-in and reviewed the Team Charter and Ground Rules.

The Team reviewed consensus items, updated the action item list, and reviewed the parking lot items from the March 2010 meeting. The updated action item list is attached to these minutes. All action items from the March 2010 meeting were discussed and completed, ongoing Action Items were noted.

Action Item A-010610 – David G. would like to keep action item A-190310 (Site 1107) open and plans to have path forward by mid-July.

Consensus Item 01 – The March 16 & 17, 2010 meeting minutes have been approved after amended with editorial comments and changes. A final copy of the approved minutes will be sent to the team and archived.

The location of the August meeting was discussed and will be determined by Gerry at a later date.

2. Partnering Training (8:34-9:02 a.m.)

Stephanie C. provided a presentation on “Temperament”. Each of the Team members’ type was explained with regard to preferential characteristics. The goal of this exercise was to help Team members understand the types of people with whom they partner, which can be beneficial during Team meetings in resolving issues.

3. Break (9:02-9:15 a.m.)

4. MRP Site Update (9:15-10:05 a.m.)

John S. discussed the MRP efforts at NAS Pensacola. A rolling review is planned for the future of the SI report. Soil samples from three sites passed the SPLP criteria and will, therefore, be proposed for NFA. Soil samples from nine sites exceeded the SPLP criteria for lead. Groundwater samples were collected, but the results are not available yet. If lead concentrations in the groundwater samples do not exceed standards, no further groundwater investigation *may* be necessary. At the Corry Station site (which includes a residential area), only PAHs in soils exceeded criteria. Additional sampling was conducted to gather more data before a public meeting is held. Saufley Field sampling did not occur during the most recent event and will be conducted in the future when schedule and budget permit.

David G. discussed within his department whether XRF screening data could be used as more than screening data (i.e., for decision making purposes). David says the department is “*preliminarily*” open to the use of the XRF data being used to make decisions. The Saufley Field pistol range data looked promising. David did not foresee a delay in review time. A correlation curve may need to be established on a site-by-site basis.

The schedule for the MRP sites is imperative. September 30, 2010, is the deadline for the SI. USEPA will only be reviewing the MRP and CERCLA sites at NAS Pensacola where FFA NPL listings apply (excluding Bronson, Saufley, or Corry Station).

5. Break (10:05-10:10 a.m.)

6. RAB Presentation (10:10-11:13 a.m.)

Gerry W. and Greg C. showed Team members the RAB presentation for Site 44 – Former UST Site 3221 SW to be given tonight at 6:00 p.m. A press release was issued to notify the public and RAB members. The Site 44 background and history were covered along with previous investigations and documentation. The current use of the site is as an aircraft wash rack for cleaning parts and aircraft for the Naval Air Museum. COCs for the site include cPAH (soil) and TCE (groundwater). Patty suggests SCTLs be discussed for public knowledge/understanding. Remedial Action Objectives were determined to prevent exposure and separate Human Health Risk Assessments were conducted using both USEPA and FDEP regulations/criteria.

Risks were discussed. Receptors with risks greater than FDEP target risk levels were discussed (FDEP levels are more sensitive/ more protective (lower) than USEPA). Helen explained that the issue of differing risk levels would be handled on a case-by-case basis. USEPA cannot overlook state regulations if sites do not meet state regulations. However previously USEPA has approved a ROD without State concurrence. Does USEPA agree that ARARs in the ROD is acceptable? Greg F. tells Gerry to leave the ROD as it is with LUCs. David G. pointed out the FFA allows use of State criteria when State ARARs are more stringent. USEPA accepts the FDEP standards for ROD language, but not secondary standards.

Site 44 Remedial Alternatives evaluated include the following:

- Soil Alternative S-0 (no action) was not protective enough.
- Soil Alternative S-1 (LUCs) will cost \$86,000 over a 30-year period.
- Groundwater Alternative G-0 (no action) not protective enough.
- Groundwater Alternative G-1 (Natural Attenuation, LUCs, and Monitoring) will cost \$271,000 for about a 10-year period.
- Groundwater Alternative G-2 (in-situ groundwater treatment, LUCs, and monitoring) \$913,000 over 5 year period.

The remedy proposed (preferred) in the Proposed Plan is S-1 and G-1. The next step in the CERCLA process includes the public comment period and ROD.

David G. saw some difficulty and disconnects with the presentation and Proposed Plan but will provide comments next week. The presentation was updated to incorporate Team comments and suggestions.

7. Break (11:13-11:20 a.m.)

8. Tier II Update (11:20 a.m.-12:00 p.m.)

Helen L. gave a Tier II update. The Navy and Tier II is considering forming a separate Partnering Team for Saufley Field. Action items from the most recent Tier II meeting were covered. Distribution of the Tier II meeting minutes was discussed. Organizational positions for the various agencies were discussed as openings in the future seem imminent. ARARs were discussed and Helen indicated the Navy has a new Tool Kit for completions of RODs. One question that came up was “LUC principles” that came about after some LUCs were put in place. RIPs and RODs and “how we count our beans” were discussed. Federal Facilities should be good examples and stewards of following FFAs. If a 5-year review is coming up, please submit the documents early to allow for USEPA review. The oil spill was discussed and what to do if oil is seen on base.

Helen indicated that the Tier II goals include RODs in correct format; 5-year reviews submitted early; petroleum SMP submitted by December 15, 2010; and methods for Team review.

9. Lunch (12:00-1:30 p.m.)

10. Gantt Chart, Document Priority Table, SCAP, and Exit Strategy (1:30-2:15 p.m.)

Gerry W. presented the Gantt Chart and reviewed the Document Tracking and Priority Table (which was used to update the Gantt Chart). The Gantt Chart should be updated at every meeting. The color coding for both documents was discussed.

OU 1

The UFP-SAP will have the annual monitoring report in October.

OU 13

OU 13 is being monitoring by Aerostar.

OU 2

The UFP-SAP is currently under Navy review; the Team expects to review the draft final version with incorporated comments next week.

OU 11/Site 38

Final RD is on hold. Soil confirmation sampling has been completed. The Draft UFP-SAP for groundwater is currently under regulatory review. The soil sampling event has been completed along with the Confirmation Soil Sampling Letter Report. The Navy is addressing the regulator comments. Ron explained the current situation and data. The Team will visit the site Thursday. David feels that what is being proposed in the confirmatory sample report is not what is in the ROD. Patty would like a path forward in order to meet USEPA compliance.

Gerry asked, "Can an alternate legal approach be accepted or must a dig/excavation occur"? David thinks it could be acceptable to consider an alternate legal approach if it tied into the LUCs and shows that contamination has not affected groundwater. He is also concerned it must meet surface water standards. An excavation may be the best alternative because one may be required even if a monitoring well is installed down gradient (ending up costing more in the end). Concerning the dieldrin concentrations, some pesticide sites have been accepted with the argument of legal application (but it is listed in the ROD). If groundwater has been affected, the soils are considered a continuing source and would need to be removed anyway. David says to include in the RD additional monitoring well installation; conduct SPLP analysis of soils or do the soil excavation.

Parking lot item - OU 11 RD comments will become an agenda item on the next conference call.

OU2, OU11, Site 43, 44, 45 are top priorities that help meet agency goals.

OU 16/Site 41 (Wetlands)

The Navy has completed the RTCs for regulators comments on the technical memorandum. However, David G. indicated that he has responses to the response to comments. Patty asked, "Can the FS move forward"? David recommended possibly removing the COCs the risk assessors agreed with in their comments and retaining the ones originally proposed in the RI before the memo. If we cannot come to an agreement, we will defer to the RI with the incorporation of the tech memo agreement. Greg F. has already approved the document.

OU 18/Site 43

The ROD has been signed and the Remedial design is in Navy review.

OU 19/Site 44

The FS is approved. The Proposed Plan is being presented tonight at the RAB meeting. The regulators still need to comment on the Proposed Plan.

OU 20/Site 45

USEPA and FDEP have been sent RTCs from Navy on the FS. The Proposed Plan will be issued next week to the Navy. The Team has scheduled the ROD for this Fiscal Year. A RAB meeting may be required later.

OU 21/ Site 46

The draft final FS comments are being addressed. A ROD is proposed for next Fiscal Year.

11. Continue Gantt Chart-Petroleum Sites (1:30-3:10 p.m.)

UST Site 1159

Solutions IES will give a presentation tomorrow.

Site 19, 24 and 25 w

Sam will cover in detail tomorrow. CH2M Hill is waiting for the permit from the ACOE for Site 19, but the FDEP permit is in. A gopher tortoise survey will be conducted along with a land survey and utilities survey is planned for the end of July after which the RAP addendum will be written.

UST 22/Site 21-

This site is a parking lot item.

Building 782-

Site is scheduled for on-board review tomorrow.

Building 2279

Site is not updated on schedule currently waiting on funding.

Building 3644

Site is scheduled for on-board review tomorrow. Greg and Patty explain the funding issues for the facility petroleum sites.

UST Site 2/Building 2662

The UFP-SAP has been approved by FDEP and can move forward.

UST 15/Site 1120

The Team is attempting to get a RMO 2 closure for this site. The initial quarterly sampling was completed earlier this month.

UST 15/ Site 1107

This site is a Parking Lot item.

Site 1116-

The Biotraps were removed from the monitoring wells earlier this month and are currently being analyzed.

Berthing Pier

This site is scheduled for an onboard review tomorrow.

Corry Station

UFP-SAP was approved by FDEP EPA has indicated they will not review or comment on site at Outlying Landing fields not included in the NAS Pensacola FFA.

12. Break (3:10-3:25 p.m.)

13. OU 2 RAD Update (3:25-4:05 p.m.)

Pat Owens gave a presentation on OU 2 Radium Sites which included Sites 12, 25, and 27. RASO, MARSSIM approach, approach at NAS Pensacola, project management team, and time frames were covered. The RASP program management was covered. NAVSEADDET is the branch under which RASO operates. The MARSSIM approach includes: 1) Planning phase of the Data Cycle (scenarios A or B), 2) Implementation phase, 3) Assessment phase, 4) Decision Making phase. A Work Plan for NAS Pensacola was presented detailing the approach and concerns.

- Site 12 DRMO readings came back rather “hot”.
- Site 25/Building 780- no remediation is proposed at this time.
- Site 27/ Former B709 Parking Lot readings were “hot” along the drain pipe.

The work schedule was reviewed. Surveys were performed in April 2009 and will commence again in August 2010. The work plan was approved June 2010. Field work is scheduled for July 2010 with the Final Report projected for Fall/Winter 2010.

Updates will be provided to the team prior to the document submittal.

14. OU 2 Removal Update (4:05-4:45 p.m.)

Sam N. gave a presentation on upcoming OU 2 Removal. Sam explained how the sites evolved in order to help them expeditiously review the UFP-SAPs. Sites include 11, 12, 25, 26, 27, and 30 (all on the eastern part of the base).

Soil sampling at the sites was discussed.

- Each site has a typical soil “hotspot” of 40x40 feet. Any hot spots under paved areas were removed from the scope of work to be removed from the original list. COCs for soils were mainly metals, pesticides, PAHs, and PCBs.
- Pre-excavation confirmatory sampling will include side wall samples (4) and a floor sample (1). The larger ones (greater than 40x40 feet) may have 6 and 2 sidewall and floor samples taken, respectively. This approach is based on the FS and ROD and best professional judgment.

Groundwater sampling for LTM will also be conducted (total of 30 wells).

- Groundwater COCs included in the ROD were called out in WS #14 (additional analytes were included in “analytes of interest”).

Note: The backfill material will be sampled (totals) before used in excavation areas to test for leachability. This data along with the confirmation sampling could be used in the future to close out the site.

15. 1st Day Meeting Closeout – Review Action Items/Consensus Items (4:45-5:00 p.m.)

16. 2nd Day Check In (8:00-8:22 a.m.)

17. UST Site 18 Treatability Study (8:22-8:30 a.m.)

Gerry W. gave an update on Site 18. The biotrap were recently sent to the lab, and we are waiting on the data. In approximately three months, TtNUS expects to have the RAP drafted.

18. Site 41 Wetlands (8:30-8:45 a.m.)

Consensus Item 03- The scheduled teleconference meetings that typically are held on the first Friday were moved to the first Monday of every month at 2:00 p.m.

- A teleconference with risk assessors from all parties is proposed for the 19th or 26th of July.

Action Item A-020610- David G. will discuss with Ligia if risk assessors are available for the proposed Site 41 wetland teleconference on July 19 or 26, 2010.

Action Item A-030610- Gerry W. will send out a meeting place invitation to the Team for the teleconference.

Gerry asked if the FS could be fast tracked in order to speed up the process. The response was no, but if the tech memo is resolved, there may not be a problem with the risk assessors and the FS.

19. Facility Update (8:45-8:50 a.m.)

Greg C. gave an update on base activities. BP is on base to clean up the oil.

Action Item A-040610- Greg C. will check with his base contact about having a team building exercise with a flight simulator.

20. Break (8:50-9:00 a.m.)

21. UST Site 1159 Bronson (9:00- 9:33 a.m.)

Dawn M. and Brian with Solutions IES gave a presentation on activities at the site. The base monitoring event, AS/SVE system startup, and O&M were covered. In March, the groundwater levels and groundwater samples from 32 monitoring wells were collected. BTEX, TRPH, and Lead are the COCs at the site. Laboratory results showed several contaminants exceeded criteria. No PAHs were detected.

- **David G. approves PAHs and MTBE being dropped from the sampling plan from this point forward.**

Can ferrous iron be sampled in the field with color metric kits versus being sent to the lab?

- **David G. can agree to have ferrous iron being sampled in the field.**

The system had been optimized but still would have exceeded FDEP threshold if run 24/7. This week the catalyst will be replaced by the manufacturer in order to meet the threshold. They hope this will alleviate the problem and they can begin work next week operating as proposed. Patty asked if the ferrous iron does not clean up, what is the next step. Brian explained they would have to evaluate that after they get the startup done this week to see where to go from there. Hector asked where the high lead concentrations in several wells could be from. They do not know as this is the baseline sampling event. Quarterly sampling is scheduled.

22. Break (9:33-9:45 a.m.)

23. UST Sites 19, 24, and 25 update (9:45-10:45 a.m.)

Hector H. gave a presentation on the Site 19 Fuel Farm Pipeline Leak Area at OU 2. The site location was referenced along with the site plan with pipeline. Wet seasons were discussed as well as site history. The current site status and CSM were presented. The groundwater at the site has exceedances in the shallow, intermediate, and deep wells. The concentrations of contaminants were presented along with potentiometric groundwater flow. A budget analysis for the site was run. The soil had few exceedances of SCTLs.

The Path forward includes gopher tortoise screening, wetlands permitting, tortoise pre-construction confirmatory survey, third party utility locate, NASP dig permitting, hot spot delineation and treatment, Final RD with CSM, and then remedy implementation. Confirmatory DPT sampling will be performed in zones below the deep wells.

There is currently not enough funding to remove the pipeline; removal of the pipeline would be ideal. The pipe has a metal sleeve; however there may also be asbestos underneath and that would need to be disposed of properly. If there is money left over, they may be able to remove the pipeline above ground. David wondered if removing the

pipe would help others gain access to portions of the site. Hector explained that it would help facilitate access to contamination.

MIP/DPT confirmatory investigation is discussed. This work will help give a better vertical and horizontal profile of contamination. The ECD data will help in the decision making process. LIF was not chosen since NAPL was not seen.

David stated that groundwater flows in different directions at different depths at this site. This explains why we see some of the concentrations where we do and to look closer and investigate further the deep zones to get a big picture view. They are looking to see if this Site might be connected to Site 18.

The wetland permit was approved. The potential AAS layout was covered (one system and two treatment areas). The lithology will need to be evaluated further. The road will still be accessible as everything relating to the system will be buried.

Sam asked Greg C. if the existing transformer can be utilized. If the cable is able conduct electricity, they can utilize the power source. It may just need to be re-energized. CH2M Hill will need to get with the base electricians to determine if such actions can be arranged.

UST Site 24 and 25 were then briefly discussed by Sam N.

24. Break (10:45-11:50 a.m.)

25. UST Site 2 Update (11:50 a.m.-12:00 p.m.)

Gerry W. covered the present Site status. The UFP-SAP was submitted and approved by David G. The field work will commence within the next month.

26. Onboard Review (UFP-SAP for OU 2 GW/SW; Site 44 Proposed Plan; OU 11 Confirmation Sampling Report; OU 4 MNA Report; UST Site 21 Berthing Pier UFP-SAP; & UST Site 21; and the Seawall) (12:00-1:30 p.m.)

OU 2 GW/SW UFP-SAP: This report will be submitted next week to the regulators.

Site 44 Proposed Plan: Greg F. had several issues with the presentation. The format of the document is very similar to a Navy format Patty suggested for the public. The content is discussed to ensure the accuracy of technical proposed plan actions is being met. David saw an issue with the section on ARARs, for example. The wording bothered him. Gerry would like his comments on the wordsmithing/editorial comments to incorporate them. Greg F. did not have an okay from his upper management/lawyer on this document.

Action Item A-050610- David G. and Greg F. will have *their* written comments to Gerry by July 08, 2010 before the public comment period.

The idea is proposed that the plan move forward, and if the USEPA attorney changes something substantial, they will open up another public comment period. David G. would like the hypothetical residential language to also include the industrial worker. The State does not look at the difference. Keep the language in the section on bottom of

Pages 5 and 6. For example, the bottom of Page 7 left column, he would like the sentence to be changed from, “presents unacceptable risk to *future residents*” to “*future receptors*”. He would like this change to make universal to the document anywhere the groundwater is referred to. **Page 13, second column, second paragraph is a good example of what he would like to see throughout the document.** The remedy will stay the same; David G. just had some wordsmithing comments.

CDs will be provided to Greg C. for their library.

Administrative Record:

The AR is almost complete. There are still a few documents that are needed.

27. Break (12:00-1:30 p.m.)

28. Onboard Review continued (1:30-2:20 p.m.)

OU 11, Site 38: The Confirmation Soil Sampling Report (submitted in February 2010) was discussed. The conclusions and recommendations were discussed in detail. The soil and groundwater results were covered.

Ron discussed that, preliminarily, what we know has been removed for soil was included in reports. Now, they want to incorporate post-removal data. The ROD states the proposed remedy, but was not truly followed after hurricane funds were used to remove the contamination.

How can we demonstrate the path forward and meet the ROD criteria? Conceptually David G. was okay with what was presented by Ron. The first goal is to satisfy the industrial level exposure criteria and then remove the contaminated areas. David G. indicated the RD needs to mainly address the groundwater and satisfy the one location that has the highest dieldrin hit.

Running an SPLP is the cheapest alternative (if the lab can reach a detection limit of 0.002), and if it passes GCTLs, it must also meet surface water criteria. Brian proposed a temporary monitoring well point be installed to collect a groundwater sample. David wanted to know what we need to do for groundwater. He thinks we could put in a permanent monitoring well between the boat slip (surface water) and the hot spot and continue monitoring it. David thought if a well was put in there and tied into the whole site groundwater monitoring plan, it would solve the problem of demonstrating the area has not leached into groundwater. David indicated the PQL criteria may need to be used. Brian suggested just taking a surface water sample and incorporating it in the groundwater sampling plan. Paving over the hot spot area may actually be the next best option. Patty was concerned that they are out of compliance and, therefore, the issue needs to be resolved today. TtNUS could perform a post ROD pre-design phase interim-removal (pre-design IRA).

Gerry suggested excavating a 5'x5'x2' area with 5 confirmation samples. This may be the best option. David suggested installing a permanent well is the best option.

Consensus Item 04: Based on dieldrin leachability exceedances at soil sample location 38 SB 11, a monitoring well will be installed downgradient of the sample location and incorporated as part of the long-term monitoring plan for OU 11 and sampled for dieldrin.

Action Item A-060610- Ron will create a tech memo to demonstrate post removal data (soil concentrations) result in acceptable industrial risk levels by the end of July.

29. Break (2:20-2:30 p.m.)

30. Onboard Review Continued (2:30-3:05 p.m.)

OU 4 MNA Report:

Action Item A-070610- Patty will verify if Greg F. received a CD of the 2010 OU 4 Monitoring Report.

It is in question as to whether this site needs its arsenic levels meet the new criteria of 10 versus the old number of 50. Patty remembered this issue was covered when she first came on to the team, and they decided to keep the old criteria.

Will the wells being sampled now suffice for sampling to current criteria or will the old wells need to be added. How many wells will need to be sampled?

Action Item A-080610- Gerry will check the meeting minutes and 5- year review for documentation for OU 4 arsenic level discussion.

David suggested that the contract might allow them to continue sampling the same number of wells without adding any, but monitoring to the new criteria of 10. Monitoring well 74 is downgradient, is clean, and has remained clean. Monitoring well 65-R and 4-R is upgradient, and it is proposed that well be dropped and swapped for a downgradient well (72). The rest would be kept “as is” in the recommendations of the report.

- An onboard review form is filled out by David G. to act as the written documentation and approval for the OU 4 path forward as captured on next page (Gerry will email the document to the Team):

NAS PENSACOLA Partnering Team Meeting Onboard Review Approval Form

Today's Date: 6/30/2010

Document: Year 2010 Second Semi-Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report, OU 4, Site 15

Document Dated: April 2010 (Draft), June 2010 (Final)

Comments: Figure 4 mistakenly shows 15MW74 not sampled. Per Table 3, arsenic concentrations in that well was <5.0 µg/L. To make the monitoring plan acceptable with the arsenic groundwater cleanup number of 10 µg/L, compliance well 15MW72 should be added. Upgradient well 15GR04R can be removed because it has had 2 consecutive groundwater sampling events below current arsenic GCTL (10 µg/L). 15MW74 needs to be retained as compliance well.

Approval: David P. Grabka/ FDEP

UST Site 21 Berthing Pier UFP-SAP:

David had his comments on his desk back at the office and just needs to send them out.

UST Site 2 UFP-SAP:

The UFP SAP letter approval was sent out last week.

UST Site 782, 1917, 3644 and Seawall Site:

David and Greg C. discussed the situations at these sites on their own with the scribe recording pertinent details and/or decisions.

Seawall Site 38 report needs to compare the GW analytical results to surface water CTLs as well as GCTLs. Deep well does not show any potential contamination to surface water based on analytical results (i.e., infiltration under seawall). MTBE should be removed from the analyte list.

Action Item A-090610- Greg will check on the funding for the seawall and report to Patty.

1917:

Add naphthalene as an analyte to be monitored. Dave agrees MNA of groundwater is an acceptable remedy at this time in order to get partial closure. If the facility ended up on the BRAC list or the building was demolished, then the contamination under the building would need to be addressed.

Site 3644:

Change recommendation section to recommend MNA for quarterly groundwater monitoring of lead, PAHs, BTEX, and TRPH. The monitoring wells to be sampled will include source wells 1, 2, 5, 6, and 12 and down gradient wells 8 and 18.

Site 782:

The Navy is to recommend (in SAR Addendum) sampling for lead in monitoring wells with exceedances for one more quarter. If concentrations are below GCTLs, then recommend the site for NFA.

31. Parking Lot Items (4:05-4:21 p.m.)

Meeting minutes have editorial changes to be made.

The conference call schedule was touched on again.

Sites 44 and 45 ROD dates are discussed (SCAP dates and meeting the ROD date goals).
Greg F. is willing to hold off pushing the SCAP dates back until the second week of July.

The next conference call will be July 19 or 26, 2010, for the Site 41 risk discussion.

The Exit Strategy is due August 13, 2010.

UST 22

David G. would like to put in more monitoring wells.

Action Item A-100610-Gerry will arrange a conference call/ or meeting with David to address the comments David G. has and will report the outcome to Patty.

UST 15, Building 1167 is briefly discussed.

32. 2nd Day Meeting Closeout – Review Action Items/Consensus Items/Meeting Schedule/Next Agenda/Plus-Delta/Facilitator Evaluation (4:21-5:07 p.m.)

- Reviewed Action Items
- Reviewed Consensus Items
- Agenda is critiqued
- Team completed a meeting evaluation

Priority Sites at NAS Pensacola:

1. OU 2 UFP-SAP (CH2M Hill)
2. Site 44 PP
3. Site 45 PP
4. Site 45 FS
5. OU 11 Site 38
6. Site 41
7. Corry Station Site 2, 3, and 4 UFP-SAP
8. Site 19 MIP
9. Site 44 ROD
10. Site 45 ROD
11. OU 2 GSI UFP-SAP

Plus +

Productive meeting/good discussion

Onboard reviews

Meeting minutes

Tier II update

Greg F. as the leader

Decisions and progress at sites

RAB meeting

Greg C. Team building dinner

Delta Δ

Hotel

Facilitator Feedback

The facilitator (Stephanie Carroll) reviewed items she plans on placing in her report.

The next teleconference is scheduled for July 19, 2010.

MEETING ADJOURNED at 5:07 p.m.

New Action Items from June 29 & 30, 2010 Meeting				
Action Item No.	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item
A-010610	David G.		Mid July	Site 1107: David will review reports again to investigate where to go from here.
A-020610	David G.		July 07, 2010	Site 41: David G. will discuss with Ligia to determine if risk assessors are available for the proposed Site 41 wetland teleconference on July 19 or 26.
A-030610	Gerry W.		July 08, 2010	Site 41: Gerry W. will send out a meeting place invitation sent out to the Team for the teleconference.
A-040610	Greg C.		No limit	Greg C. will check with his base contact about having a team building exercise with the flight simulator.
A-050610	Greg F. and David G.		July 08, 2010	Site 44 Proposed Plan: David G. and Greg F. will have <i>their</i> written comments to Gerry before the public comment period.
A-060610	Ron K.		End of July	OU 11/ Site 38: Ron will create a tech memo to demonstrate post removal data (soil concentrations) result in acceptable industrial risk levels by end of July.
A-070610	Patty W.		July 09, 2010	OU 4: Patty will verify if Greg F. received a CD of the 2010 OU 4 Monitoring Report.
A-080610	Gerry W.		July 09, 2010	OU 4: Gerry will check the meeting minutes 5- year review for documentation on the OU 4 arsenic level discussion.
A-090610	Greg C.		July 09, 2010	Seawall Site: Greg will check on the funding for the seawall and report to Patty.
A-100610	Gerry W.		July 09, 2010	UST 22: Gerry will arrange a conference call/or meeting with David to address the comments David G. has and will report to Patty the outcome.

Consensus Item 01 – The March 16 & 17, 2010 meeting minutes have been approved after amended with editorial comments and changes. A final copy of the approved minutes will be sent to the team and archived.

Consensus Item 02 - The 4th quarter meeting in Sarasota will be held November 30 and December 1, 2010.

Consensus Item 03- *The scheduled teleconference meetings that are typically held on the first Fridays were moved to the first Monday of every month at 2:00 p.m.*

Consensus Item 04: *Based on dieldrin leachability exceedances at soil sample location 38 SB 11, a monitoring well will be installed downgradient of the sample location and incorporated as part of the long-term monitoring plan for OU 11 and sampled for dieldrin.*